DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 041 TM 016 571

AUTHOR Marso, Ronald N.; Pigge, Fred L.
TITLE Testing Directors', Principals', Supervisors', and Teachers' Perceptions of the Actual Purposes of School Standardized Testing Programs.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education (Chicago, IL, April 4-6, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Comparative Analysis; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Group Testing; Mail Surveys; Principals; Program Evaluation; *Public Schools; School Surveys; Secondary School Teachers; *Standardized Tests; Supervisors; *Teacher Attitudes; *Testing Programs; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS *Test Directors

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of testing directors, school principals, teacher supervisors, and classroom teachers concerning the actual purposes of public school standardized group testing programs were studied. Surveys were mailed to superintendents in 97 randomly selected public school districts. The superintendents forwarded survey packets to selected principals and supervisors; standardized testing program directors; and elementary school and secondary school principals, who forwarded survey packets to selected classroom teachers. A total of 505 respondents from non-vocational public schools (82 testing directors, 48 teacher supervisors, 157 building principals, and 218 elementary school and secondary school classroom teachers) rank ordered statements describing the purposes of their school testing programs. In contrast to the results of previous research findings, it was found that most educators appropriately perceive the primary purpose of testing programs to be for classroom instructional use. Additionally, it was found that: teacher supervisors' perceptions of the importance of various purposes of testing programs differed sharply from other educators' perceptions and appeared to be in direct conflict with their role as instructional leaders; elementary school and secondary school educators' perceptions of testing purposes sharply differed from each other; and testing directors' perceptions of testing program purposes varied with the extent and nature of their training in testing and evaluation. Five data tables and a 24-item list of references are included. (Author/RLC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

RONALD N. MARSO

FRED L. PIGGE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Testing Directors', Principals', Supervisors', and Teachers' Perceptions of the Actual Purposes of School Standardized Testing Programs

Ronald N. Marso and Fred L. Pigge
Educational Foundations and Inquiry
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

A paper presented at the annual conference of the
National Council for Measurement in Education
Chicago, Illinois
April 3-7, 1991

ED333041

Abstract

This study was designed to ascertain testing directors', school principals', teacher supervisors', and classroom teachers' perceptions of the actual purposes of public school standardized group testing programs. A total of 505 educators from nonvocational public schools rank ordered statements describing the purposes of their school testing programs. In contrast to the results of previous research findings, it was found that most educators appropriately perceive the primary purpose of testing programs to be for classroom instructional use. Additionally, it was found that teacher supervisors' perceptions of the importance of various purposes of testing programs differed sharply from other educators' perceptions and appeared to be in direct conflict with their role as instructional leaders, that elementary and secondary educators' perceptions of testing purposes sharply differed one from the other, and that testing directors' perceptions of testing program purposes varied with the extent and nature of their training in testing and evaluation.

TM016571

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Testing Directors', Principals', Supervisors', and Teachers' Perceptions of the Actual Purposes of School Standardized Testing Programs

The increased use of tests in the formal educational process for policy-driven decision making in recent years, such as to assess pupil and teacher minimum competencies and to ascertain high school graduation proficiencies, has renewed and increased concerns about the appropriate management of and the use of standardized tests in the public schools (Airasian, 1987; Cannell, 1988; Haney & Madaus, 1989). Little is known about how these new policy-driven testing programs are managed, who manages them, or how this testing may influence instruction-driven standardized testing programs in the public schools. For example, Airasian and Madaus (1983) expressed concern that the management of policy oriented testing might have a negative impact upon the already over-taxed time and responsibilities of testing directors in the public schools. Relatedly, Marso and Pigge (1990) found that approximately one-half of their sample of public school testing directors reported being responsible for their school districts' state mandated minimum competency testing programs which suggests that policy-oriented testing demands may indeed be having a negative impact upon the time that testing directors have available for meeting their other responsibilities.

The limited research available on testing in the public schools suggests that the purposes of standardized group testing programs in the public schools are neither well understood by educators nor well articulated within the school organizations in the public schools. This research also has revealed that classroom teachers and perhaps educators in general are not well trained in testing and evaluation (Crooks, 1988; Diamond & Fremer, 1989; Ruddell, 1985; Stiggins, Conklin, & Bridgeford, 1986); further, Marso and Pigge (1990) reported that as many as one out of five public school testing directors have no more formal testing and evaluation training than might be expected of a beginning classroom teacher.

Other studies have suggested that schools place little emphasis on the management of their school standardized testing programs. For example, many schools do not have individuals designated as director of their testing programs (Gullickson & Hopkins, 1987; Marso & Pigge, 1990; Sproull & Zubrow, 1981), and many researchers have described the linkage between standardized tests and classroom instruction as at best weak and unclear (Kinney, Brickell, & Lynn, 1988; Tyler & Sheldon, 1979).

Research findings also suggest that in order for classroom teachers to make use of test results, test results need to be immediately accessible, need to be integrated with teachers' daily instructional activities, and need to be consistent in content with the content being taught. Standardized testing in many schools, however, typically does not meet these conditions; standardized tests are often scheduled at the end rather than at the beginning of the school year, and the results from these tests commonly are not made

available to teachers until six to eight weeks after the test is administered (Dorr-Bremme, 1983; Hall, Carroll, & Comer, 1988).

Further, educators often do not have a positive attitude toward standardized testing. For example, school counselors frequently feel that testing services dominate too much of their time (Miller, 1977); teachers' attitudes toward standardized testing are commonly described as indifferent or neutral, and they view these tests as being much less useful than teacher-made tests (Green & Stager, 1985; Yeh, 1981); and even though counselors and administrators tend to perceive standardized test results as being more useful than do teachers, Wood (1982) reported that administrators frequently do not review testing results nor distribute them to their teachers and that counselors and administrators, themselves, do not clearly understand such basic measurement matters as the relationship between innate ability and current measures of academic aptitude.

Relative to educators' perceptions of the purposes of standardized tests, Stetz and Beck (1981) concluded that teachers and administrators appear to have a balanced perspective of the merits and appropriate uses of standardized tests, that they perceived these tests to be "somewhat" useful and use the results to "some degree," and that they are most supportive of these tests when used for instructional purposes. Other researchers, however, have reported that those educators further removed from actual test use tend to regard tests and test use more positively than those educators actually using the tests and that educators perceive that others rather than themselves receive the primary benefits from standardized testing. For example, Wood (1982) reported that counselors and administrators tended to rate tests to be more useful for classroom instructional purposes than did teachers, and following interviews with educators Salmon-Cox (1981) and Sproull and Zubrow (1981) concluded that classroom teachers and school administrators both felt that the primary benefits of their school testing programs accrued not to themselves but to the other.

The purpose of the present study was to ascertain public school testing directors', school principals', teacher supervisors', and classroom teachers' perceptions of the actual purposes of their school standardized group testing programs. More specifically, this study was conducted to investigate the following questions related to these educators' perceptions of the purposes of their school standardized testing programs: 1) To what extent do testing directors, principals, supervisors, and teachers agree in their perceptions of the actual purposes of their school testing programs? Do these perceptions vary between educators employed in schools with exempted village, city, or local county district administrative organizations? 2) To what extent do educators assigned to elementary or secondary schools agree in their perceptions of the actual purposes of their school testing programs? 3) Does the amount of formal training in testing and measurement or the nature of the graduate degrees held by testing directors appear to be related to their perceptions of the actual purposes of their school standardized testing programs? 4) To what extent do educators with supervisor, principal, or teacher job

assignments agree that the benefits of their school testing program accrue primarily to others and not to themselves as has been found to be true in previous research?

Methods and Procedures

The data gathered for this paper was one component of a larger state-wide assessment of the management and operation of public school standardized group testing programs in Ohio. In the initial stage of sample selection all 616 nonvocational public school districts were contacted regarding their willingness to participate in an extensive investigation of standardized testing practices and of the uses of standardized testing results by classroom teachers, administrators, and testing directors. This inquiry resulted in 171 superintendents indicating a willingness to have their school districts participate in the study.

From the 171 school districts whose superintendent expressed a willingness to participate in the study, 106 districts were randomly selected using type of administrative organization (city, county local, and exempted village) of the school districts as strata in the selection process. Of these 106 randomly selected districts, 97 districts (92%) ultimately did participate in the study. Not all of these school districts, however, were able to provide all types of respondents, for some of the districts reported not having an employee who had been designated as the director of their standardized testing programs, a few of the county local school districts reported that their standardized testing programs were managed through their county office of education, and a number of the smallest schools reported not having an elementary and/or a secondary teacher supervisor to participate in the research project.

The survey assessment instruments were mailed directly to each participating superintendent who in turn was asked to forward the sealed packets of materials to selected principals and supervisors, as well as to the standardized testing program director of the school district. The superintendents were asked to select and then to send packets to one of their elementary and one of their secondary school principals and to one of their elementary and one of their secondary teacher supervisors. The criterion provided to the superintendents for these selections was that the selected employee be one who would be most knowledgeable about and who could best inform the researchers about the practices and procedures of their school districts' standardized group testing program. Each superintendent was also directed to forward a designated survey packet to the school district's director of standardized testing or in the absence of such a designated individual to identify an employee who shares these testing responsibilities and who is most knowledgeable of the school district's standardized group testing program.

The elementary and secondary school principals receiving the survey packets from their superintendents were directed to complete the enclosed survey materials addressed specifically to them and also to forward enclosed survey packets to classroom teachers. The

elementary principals were directed to select and then to forward designated survey packets to one of their teachers assigned to grades one through four and to one of their teachers assigned to grades five or higher who could best inform the researchers about the practices and procedures of their school districts' standardized group testing program. The secondary principals were given these same directions but were asked to select one of their teachers from the math-science and one from the English-social studies subject areas.

The preceding subject selection and contact procedures resulted in the return of 505 usable survey assessment forms from 82 testing directors, 48 teacher supervisors, 157 building principals, and 218 elementary and secondary classroom teachers. These respondents were employed in schools organized by city district (42%), local county district (44%), and exempted village district (14%), in schools located in geographic settings described as rural (37%), suburban (57%), and urban (6%), and in small schools (11% with fewer than 1,000 pupils), moderately sized schools (34% with 1,000 to 2,000 pupils), moderately large schools (34% with 2,001 to 4,000 pupils), and large schools (21% with more than 4,000 pupils).

Each of the 505 respondents to the survey provided various types of information about the operation of his/her school testing program. The present paper reports how the various respondents rank ordered five statements describing the probable purposes of and the primary recipients of the benefits from their school testing programs. The directions for this ranking task were phrased in terms of "actual purposes" and "actual benefits" to differentiate between what the respondents may have perceived to be formally stated purposes in contrast to their perceptions of the actual or true purposes of their school district testing programs. This rank ordering task as presented to the participating educators follows:

Purpose of Standardized Group Testing Program

Rank order, as you see them, the actual purposes or actual benefits from your school's standardized testing program (use '1' as the most important and '5' the least important).

_____ 1. General administrative needs and purposes (administrators' benefit)
_____ 2. Curriculum assessment and planning (curriculum supervisors' benefit)
_____ 3. Screening and identification of exceptional students (exceptional students' benefit)
_____ 4. Guidance and counseling purposes (counselors' benefit)
_____ 5. Guiding classroom instruction of pupils (classroom teachers' benefit)

A mean rank order value was calculated for each of the five stated testing program purposes for the total group of respondents and separately for the testing directors, the principals, the supervisors, and the classroom teachers. Within each of these groups of educators

the ranking data was further grouped for analyses by geographic region of the employing schools (urban, suburban, and rural), by school district administrative organization (city districts, county local districts, and exempted village districts), and by the grade level assignments of the teachers, principals, and supervisors (elementary or secondary). Additionally, the testing directors' responses were grouped by the nature of their training (certified or not certified as a guidance counselor) and by the extent of their formal training in testing and evaluation (two or fewer and three or more formal university courses).

Findings

The analysis of the data from the total group of 505 educators revealed that guiding classroom instruction of pupils was perceived to be the most important purpose of public school standardized group testing programs with an average rank of 2.55. The fact that this mean differs markedly from 1.00 (the highest rank) reveals that there was considerable variation in the ranks given to the instruction purpose. The remaining four purposes as ranked by the total group of respondents were: second, curriculum assessment and planning ($\bar{X}$ = 2.80), third, screening and identification of exceptional students ($\bar{X}$ = 3.09), fourth, general administrative needs and purposes ($\bar{X}$ = 3.21), and fifth, guidance and counseling purposes ($\bar{X}$ = 3.27) as reported in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 1 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The educators' perceptions of the actual purposes of their school testing programs were found to vary markedly when the respondents were grouped by the nature of their job assignments. This interpretation of a lack of agreement among the four groups of respondents' ranks of the five purposes was supported by an average Spearman Rho rank coefficient of +.10 and a nonsignificant Kendall's coefficient of concordance of .33 (one-tail p = .27) as also shown in Table 1. The largest discrepancy among the respondents was revealed for the administrative purpose of testing. The supervisors ranked this purpose to be the most important reason for their school testing programs ($\bar{X}$ = 2.75); whereas the testing directors, the principals, and the classroom teachers ranked the administrative purpose as being the least important of the five purpose statements (average ranks of 3.52, 3.36, and 3.21, respectively). The second largest discrepancy among the job assignment average rankings was for the testing purpose of guiding classroom instruction. Again, the teacher supervisors differed from the other three groups regarding this purpose. The supervisors ranked this purpose as fourth in importance or the second least important ($\bar{X}$ = 3.09); whereas the testing directors ($\bar{X}$ = 2.17), principals ($\bar{X}$ = 2.42), and the classroom teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 2.51) each ranked, on the average, this purpose as the most important of the five testing purposes.

The discrepancies among the four job assignment groups for the remaining three stated purposes of school testing programs were less prominent. The testing directors and the principals ranked the curriculum assessment purpose as second in importance ($\bar{X}$ = 2.43 and $\bar{X}$ = 2.70, respectively); whereas the teachers ranked this purpose fourth among the five testing purposes ($\bar{X}$ = 3.13). Similarly, the teachers and supervisors perceived the identification of exceptional children purpose of greater importance for a mean ranks of two ($\bar{X}$ = 2.92 and $\bar{X}$ = 2.82, respectively) than did the principals with a group mean rank of fourth ($\bar{X}$ = 3.28). And last, the principals and teachers perceived the guidance and counseling purpose as somewhat important with a group mean rank of third ($\bar{X}$ = 3.12 and $\bar{X}$ = 3.09, respectively); whereas the supervisors perceived this purpose to be of least importance for a mean rank of five ($\bar{X}$ = 3.49).

The three Spearman Rho coefficients between the purpose average ranks of the supervisors and the average ranks of the testing directors, principals, and teachers were negative (-.40, -.70, and -.50 respectively); whereas the three Spearman Rho coefficients between the purpose ranks of the testing directors, the principals, and the teachers were positive (+.90, +.70, and +.60 respectively) as shown in Table 1. These correlations further indicate the apparent discrepancies between the manner in which supervisors and the other three groups of educators (testing directors, principals, and teachers) view the actual purposes of standardized testing programs.

When the supervisors', principals', and classroom teachers' responses were classified by elementary as compared to secondary assignments (Those indicating assignments to both elementary and secondary schools [many of the supervisors] or to junior high schools were excluded from these comparisons.), three major discrepancies in perceptions of the importance of the stated purposes of their school testing programs were revealed by Spearman Rho coefficients of -.90, -.90, and -.70 between the purpose average ranks of elementary supervisors and secondary principals, between elementary principals and secondary teachers, and between elementary teachers and secondary teachers, respectively, as shown in Table 2. In fact, there was a general lack of agreement among these six sets of ranks indicated by an average Spearman Rho of -.09 and a Kendall's concordance coefficient of .09. One major exception to this pattern was that the elementary principals and elementary teachers showed considerable agreement with a Rho of +.90 between their ranks of purposes of standardized testing.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 2 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Explicitly, the elementary supervisors perceived the administrative purpose to be of most importance ($\bar{X}$ = 2.63) but the secondary supervisors perceived this purpose to be the least important ($\bar{X}$ = 3.55) among the five stated purposes for their school testing programs (The reader is cautioned that the sample size for this particular comparison was small as many of the supervisors were

assigned to both elementary and secondary schools.); the secondary principals perceived guidance and counseling uses to be most important ($\bar{X}$ = 2.00) but elementary principals perceived this purpose to be the least important ($\bar{X}$ = 3.94) of the five stated purposes; and the elementary and secondary teachers' rank orders were reversed for both the counseling and the instructional purposes of testing. The counseling uses of school testing was ranked highest by the secondary teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 2.08) but was ranked lowest ($\bar{X}$ = 3.69) by the elementary teachers, and the instructional uses of school testing was ranked highest by the elementary teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 1.92) but was ranked lowest by the secondary teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 3.48).

When examining the extent of agreement among the supervisors, then among the principals, and finally among the teachers when each group was classified by the administrative organization of their employing schools, it was found that there was just a single major discrepancy in their rankings of the five purposes of school testing programs. Teachers employed in exempted village school districts perceived guidance and counseling uses to be most important ($\bar{X}$ = 2.50); whereas the classroom teachers employed in city schools perceived guidance and counseling uses to be least important ($\bar{X}$ = 3.30), with a Spearman Rho = -.60 between the two sets of ranks. The other six coefficients (one for supervisors, three for principals, and the remaining two for teachers) ranged between +.20 and +1.00 as reported in Table 3. The average Rho of these latter six correlations was +.57.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 3 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

When the testing directors were classified by employment in either rural or suburban school districts, their rankings of the five testing purposes did not differ (Rho = +1.00, see Table 4). The rankings of the testing directors when they were classified by type of school organization did differ, however. Those employed in county local school districts perceived guidance and counseling uses as being somewhat more important with an average rank of 2.94 as compared to directors employed in city schools who gave an average rank of 3.69, and those employed in exempted villages gave an average rank of 3.82. The directors when classified by type of school organization indicated a moderate degree of agreement in their perceptions of the actual purposes of standardized testing programs (average Rho of +.42 and a Kendall's w of .61, p = .12, as shown in Table 4).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 4 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Neither the extent of training in tests and measurements nor the counselor or noncounselor nature of testing directors' current or past job functions appeared to be related to major discrepancies in the testing directors' perceptions of the purposes of their school testing programs. The Spearman Rho coefficient between the ranks given to the

testing purposes by the directors when classified by training level was +.56 (one-tail p =.16) and was +.50 (one-tail p =.19) for the classification of counselor or noncounselor backgrounds. The largest rank discrepancies within these classifications were found with the testing directors with counselor certification and those with two or fewer testing courses perceiving administrative purposes as being somewhat more important (average ranks of 3.31 and 3.20 for ranks of 3 and 3, respectively) than did their counterparts not possessing counselor certification ($\bar{X}$ = 3.78, rank = 5) and those having completed three or more testing courses ($\bar{X}$ = 3.61, rank = 5). A second discrepancy is shown by the testing directors with counselor certification perceiving the guidance and counseling uses as being more important ($\bar{X}$ = 2.92, rank = 3) than did the directors without counselor certification ($\bar{X}$ = 3.76, rank = 5, see Table 5).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 5 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Related to the fourth question of whether or not these educators would perceive the actual benefits from their school standardized testing programs accruing to those in other job assignments than themselves as reported in previous research, the analysis of the collected data suggests that this is not the case. The classroom teachers as a total group (elementary and secondary) ranked themselves as receiving the actual primary benefit of their school's testing programs. Indeed, the building principals and the testing directors ranked themselves (administrators) as receiving the least benefit from their schools' testing programs, and they agreed with the classroom teachers that classroom instruction was of most importance. Presumably, testing specialists would concur that guiding classroom instruction of pupils (classroom teachers' benefit) should be the most important purpose of school standardized group testing programs.

Conversely, however, responses from some sub-classifications of these educators did tend to support the view that educators might perceive testing benefits actually accruing to those in other job assignments. For example, the teacher supervisors ranked the administration as the primary beneficiary of their school testing programs and rated themselves as receiving intermediate benefit (rank of 3). Additionally, secondary teachers and principals perceived the primary benefits of their school testing programs as accruing to guidance counselors and not to themselves. Thus, it appears that educators in some job assignments, but certainly not all groups of educators, perceive the primary benefits of their testing programs to accrue to those in other job assignments. This interpretation is likely an accurate perception of the reality of differing relationships between job positions and testing uses rather than an erroneous perception of the benefits of testing held by all educators.

Summary and Discussion

The total sample of 505 educators from 97 nonvocational public school districts perceived the most important purpose of their school

standardized group testing programs to be guiding the classroom instruction of pupils and of primary benefit to classroom teachers. The other four testing program purpose statements were ranked in descending order as follows: curriculum assessment and planning (benefiting supervisors), screening and identification of exceptional students (benefiting exceptional pupils), general administrative needs and purposes (benefiting administrators), and guidance and counseling purposes (benefiting counselors). The testing directors, school principals, and classroom teachers perceived the relative importance of the five testing purposes in much the same order, but the teacher supervisors differed sharply from these three groups in their ranking of the testing purpose statements. One specific example of these differences is the "reversal" pattern for the administrative purpose. The supervisors ranked this purpose first in importance and the testing directors, teachers, and principals ranked this purpose last or fifth in importance.

It was found that educators assigned to elementary schools differed sharply in their perceptions of the relative importance of the various purposes of their school standardized testing programs as compared to those educators assigned to secondary schools. Supervisors of elementary teachers ranked administrative uses of primary importance; whereas the secondary supervisors ranked the administrative uses of least importance. The principals of elementary schools ranked counseling uses of their school testing programs of least importance; whereas their secondary counterparts ranked the counseling uses as being of most importance. The teachers in elementary schools ranked counseling uses of least importance and classroom instructional uses as being of most importance; whereas the secondary teachers' rankings of these two purposes were just the reverse. Further, with the exception of considerable agreement between the perceptions of the purpose of standardized testing held by elementary teachers and elementary principals there was little agreement about the purpose of testing between teachers and administrators at either the elementary or secondary school level.

The teacher supervisors and school principals employed in school districts administratively organized as local county schools (small to medium size consolidated rural schools), city schools (moderately large to large schools), and exempted village schools (small city schools) generally ranked the five testing program purposes in much the same order. The teachers employed in exempted villages, however, perceived the primary purpose of their school testing programs to be guidance and counseling uses; whereas the teachers employed in city schools ranked guidance and counseling uses as being least important. This finding may result from the fact that guidance counselors were likely to be testing directors in the smaller school districts; whereas individuals with administrative backgrounds rather than counselors were likely to be testing directors in the city school districts. Therefore, the teachers in the exempted villages may have associated counselors with testing while their cohorts in the city schools did not.

The testing directors employed in rural and suburban schools ranked the five testing program purposes in identical order, but the testing directors employed in county local schools differed somewhat in their ranking of testing program purposes as compared to those directors employed in exempted village schools. The local county school directors ranked guidance and counseling purpose as second in importance, but the exempted village directors ranked this purpose as being least important. The data collected provided no apparent explanation for this finding; however, the sample size (N = 11) was small for the exempted village testing directors and thus this finding could be a weakness in the data itself.

The nature and extent of the training of the testing directors did not appear to be strongly related to their rank ordering of the five statements of testing program purposes. One instance of a somewhat minor discrepancy was the testing directors who had completed two or fewer university testing courses perceiving the administrative purpose of testing as being more important (rank of 3) and the counseling purpose as being less important (rank of 5) as compared to the testing directors having completed three or more testing courses (the reverse of the above ranks). A second instance of a discrepancy was that the directors with counselor certification, as might be expected, perceived the guidance and counseling purpose of school testing programs as being more important (rank of 3) than administrative uses of testing (rank of 5); whereas the testing directors without counseling certification ranked the administrative purpose (rank of 3) as being more important than the guidance and counseling purpose (rank of 5).

The findings from this study neither clearly supported nor clearly refuted previous research findings suggesting that educators perceive the primary benefits of their school testing program accruing to others rather than to themselves (Salmon-Cox, 1981; Sproull & Zubrow, 1981; Wood, 1982). The present findings did suggest, however, that this perception may be an artifact of educators' grade level assignments and differential grade level testing practices and uses rather than the educators' erroneous perceptions of the actual purpose or benefit of standardized testing programs as implied in previous research findings. Secondly, the data in the present study does clearly reveal that the perceptions of the purpose of testing varied rather considerably within the several groups of educator respondents (see the group means and standard deviations in Table 1). Overall, most educators, and particularly elementary principals and teachers, appear to perceive the most important purpose of school standardized testing programs to be to support classroom instruction, as seemingly should be the case. The teachers and principals assigned to secondary schools, however, differ from this view and rank the guidance and counseling prupose as being the most important purpose of school testing programs. This perception by secondary educators probably more accurately reflects actual standardized testing programs and practices in most high schools in contrast to the standardized testing programs and practices in the elementary schools. Standardized testing in the elementary schools tends to focus more on achievement batteries and classroom instruction in the three R's; whereas the

standardized testing in the secondary schools tends to focus more upon an academic or career advising theme (Engen, Lamb, & Prediger, 1981; Marso & Pigge, 1989; Green & Williams, 1989).

One reason that may have influenced the total group of educators in the present study to select instructional uses as the most important purpose of standardized testing is the recent availability, as compared to when some of the previously reported research studies were conducted, of criterion-referenced achievement results with its much more instructionally salient focus. Why the teacher supervisors appeared to be "out of step" with their counterpart educators in their perceptions of the most important purpose of their school testing programs is not apparent from this data. The total group of supervisors in the present study ranked instructional purposes as fourth out of the five testing purposes presented for ranking. This might suggest that teacher supervisors need to be better informed and trained regarding the uses and purposes of standardized testing programs. Administratively, supervisors should be expected to take a major leadership role in encouraging classroom teachers' effective use of standardized testing results in guiding classroom instruction. The ranking of testing purposes by the teacher supervisors in this study suggests that they are not fulfilling this particular instructional leadership role.

The perceptions of the relative importance of school standardized group testing purposes held by the testing directors would appear to be in accord with those espoused by the testing profession. The testing directors ranked the administrative purpose last, the instructional purpose was ranked first, and other strategies for reaching pupils, such as curricular assessment, were ranked highly.

Analyses of the testing directors' perceptions of the relative importance of the five purposes of standardized testing by their school geographic location, school administrative organization, and by the nature and extent of their training revealed very few real differences in their views. A tendency did seem evident, however, for directors with more training in testing and evaluation and holding counselor certification to rank administrative purposes lower and counseling purposes higher.

References

Airasian, P. W., & Madaus, G. F. (1983). Linking testing and instruction: Policy issues. Journal of Educational Measurement, 20(2), 103-119.

Airasian, P. W. (1987). State mandated testing and educational reform: Context and consequences. American Journal of Education, May, 393-412.

Cannell, J. J. (1988). Nationally normed elementary achievement testing in America's public schools: How all 50 states are above national average. Educational Measurement Issues and Practices, 7, 5-9.

Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on student. Review of Educational Research, 58, 438-481.

Diamond, E. E., & Fremer, J. (1989). The joint committee on testing practices and the code of fair testing practices in education. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 8, 23-27.

Dorr-Bremme, D. W. (1983). Assessing students: Teachers' routine practices and reasoning. Evaluation Comment, 6, 1-12.

Engen, H. B., Lamb, R. R., & Prediger, D. J. (1982). Are secondary schools still using standardized tests? The Personnel and Guidance Journal, January, 287-290.

Green, K. E., & Stager, S. F. (1985). Teachers' attitudes toward testing. A paper presented to the National Council on Measurement in Education, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 253 588).

Green, K. E., & Williams, E. J. (1989). Standardized test use by classroom teachers: Effects of training and grade level taught. Paper presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco.

Gullickson, A. R., & Hopkins, K. D. (1987). The context of educational measurement instruction for preservice teachers: Professor perspectives. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 6, 12-16.

Hall, B. W., Carroll, D., & Comer, C. B. (1988). Test use among classroom teachers and its relationship to teaching level and teaching practices. Applied Measurement in Education, 2, 145-156.

Haney, W., & Madaus, G. (1989). Searching for alternatives to standardized tests: Whys, whats, and withers. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 683-688.

Kinney, D., Brickell, J., & Lynn, M. A. (1988). Testing programs in Illinois elementary school districts: The relationships between standardized achievement, competency-based, and teacher-made tests. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New Orleans.

Marso, R. N., & Pigge, F. L. (1989). Standardized and competency testing programs: Classroom teachers' needs and proficiencies as viewed by principals and supervisors. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 304 473).

Marso, R. N., & Pigge, F. L. (1990). Training, job titles, and responsibilities of directors of public school standardized testing programs. A paper presented at the National Council for Measurement in Education.

Miller, G. M. (1977). After the testing is over. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, December, 139-143.

Ruddell, R. B. (1985). Knowledge and attitudes toward testing: Field educators and legislators. The Reading Teacher, 38, 538-543.

Salmon-Cox, L. (1981). Teachers and standardized achievement tests: What's really happening? Phi Delta Kappan, 631-634.

Sproull, L., & Zubrow, D. (1981). Standardized testing from the administrative perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 628-631.

Stetz, F. P., & Beck, M. D. (1981). Attitudes toward standardized tests: Students, teachers, and measurement specialists. Measurement in Education, 12, 1-11.

Stiggins, R. J., Conklin, N. F., & Bridgeford, N. J. (1986). Classroom assessment: A key to effective education. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 5, 5-17.

Tyler, R. W., & Sheldon, H. W. (1979). Testing, teaching, and learning. Report of a Conference on Research on Testing. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Yeh, J. P. (1981). Teachers and testing: A survey of test use. Center for the Study of Evaluation, California University, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 218 336).

Wood, C. M. (1982). The role of standardized achievement tests in the management of instruction: A survey of teacher and administrator practices and attitudes. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 219 446).

30/1

Table 1

Means, Ranks, and Correlations Describing How the Total Groups of Supervisors, Testing Directors, Principals, and Classroom Teachers Responded to the Five Purposes for Standardized Testing

	Supervisors (48)[a]			Directors (82)			Principals (157)			Teachers (218)			Total Group (504)		
Purpose	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank
1. Administration	2.75	1.47	1	3.52	1.53	5	3.36	1.41	5	3.21	1.52	5	3.21	1.48	4
2. Curriculum	2.93	1.39	3	2.43	1.28	2	2.70	1.24	2	3.13	1.24	4	2.80	1.29	2
3. Exceptional	2.82	1.33	2	3.31	1.32	3	3.28	1.35	4	2.92	1.22	2	3.09	1.31	3
4. Counseling	3.49	1.26	5	3.38	1.23	4	3.12	1.52	3	3.09	1.45	3	3.27	1.37	5
5. Instruction	3.09	1.58	4	2.17	1.22	1	2.42	1.31	1	2.51	1.51	1	2.55	1.41	1

Spearman Rho Coefficients[b]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. Supervisors	-	-.40 (p=.25)[c]	-.70 (p=.09)	-.50 (p=.20)
2. Testing Directors		-	+.90 (p=.02)	+.70 (p=.09)
3. Principals			-	+.60 (p=.14)
4. Teachers				-

[a] N's are presented inside parentheses.

[b] Other related findings: 1) average of the six Rho coefficients is +.10, 2) Kendall's coefficient of concordance, w = .33, p = .27.

[c] All p's are one-tail probabilities.

Table 2

Means, Ranks, and Correlations Describing How Elementary and Secondary Supervisors, Principals, and Teachers Responded to the Five Standardized Testing Purposes

	Supervisors[a]				Principals				Teachers			
	Elem. (16)		Sec. (11)		Elem. (78)		Sec. (46)		Elem. (118)		Sec. (60)	
Purpose	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
1. Administration	2.63	1	3.55	5	3.14	4	3.54	4	3.34	4	3.10	3
2. Curriculum	3.06	4	3.09	4	2.46	2	2.83	2	3.06	3	3.41	4
3. Exceptional	2.69	2	2.46	1	3.09	3	3.67	5	2.81	2	2.92	2
4. Counseling	3.88	5	3.00	3	3.94	5	2.00	1	3.69	5	2.08	1
5. Instruction	2.75	3	2.91	2	2.15	1	2.89	3	1.92	1	3.48	5

Spearman Rho Coefficients[b]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1. Elementary Supervisors	-	-.10 (p=.43)[c]	+.10 (p=.43)	-.90 (p=.02)	+.30 (p=.31)	-.20 (p=.37)
2. Secondary Supervisors		-	+.30 (p=.31)	-.30 (p=.31)	+.60 (p=.14)	+.10 (p=.43)
3. Elementary Principals			-	-.20 (p=.37)	+.90 (p=.02)	-.90 (p=.02)
4. Secondary Principals				-	-.50 (p=.20)	+.10 (p=.43)
5. Elementary Teachers					-	-.70 (p=.09)
6. Secondary Teachers						-

[a] Those respondents indicating assignments both elementary and secondary schools or to junior high schools not included in these comparisons.

[b] Other related findings: 1) average of the 15 Rho coefficients is -.09, 2) Kendall's coefficient of concordance w = .09, p = .71.

[c] All p's are one-tail probabilities.

Table 3

Means, Ranks, and Correlations Describing How Supervisors, Principals, and Classroom Teachers in Three Types of School Districts Responded to the Five Standardized Testing Purposes

	Supervisors						Principals						Teachers					
	Local (28)		City (12)		Exempted[a]		Local (81)		City (53)		Exempted (20)		Local (114)		City (74)		Exempted (26)	
Purpose	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
1	2.96	3	2.50	1	--	--	3.35	5	3.53	5	3.00	3	3.30	5	3.01	3	3.35	5
2	3.11	4	2.75	2	--	--	2.84	2	2.62	2	2.30	2	3.27	4	2.88	2	3.27	4
3	2.68	1	2.92	3	--	--	3.05	4	3.51	4	3.60	5	2.89	2	3.04	4	2.73	2
4	3.36	5	3.58	5	--	--	2.98	3	3.23	3	3.40	4	3.10	3	3.30	5	2.50	1
5	2.89	2	3.25	4	--	--	2.66	1	2.13	1	2.20	1	2.35	1	2.66	1	2.77	3

Spearman Rho Coefficients[b]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1. Local Supervisors	-	+.20 (p=.37)[c]	-.10 (p=.43)	-.10 (p=.43)	-.10 (p=.43)	+.50 (p=.20)	+.30 (p=.31)	-.10 (p=.43)
2. City Supervisors		-	-.50 (p=.20)	-.50 (p=.20)	+.10 (p=.43)	-.70 (p=.09)	+.30 (p=.31)	-.90 (p=.02)
3. Local Principals			-	+1.00 (p=.00)	+.70 (p=.09)	+.60 (p=.14)	+.60 (p=.14)	+.20 (p=.37)
4. City Principals				-	+.70 (p=.09)	+.60 (p=.14)	+.60 (p=.14)	+.20 (p=.37)
5. Exempted Principals					-	+.10 (p=.43)	+.90 (p=.02)	-.50 (p=.20)
6. Local Teachers						-	+.20 (p=.37)	+.60 (p=.14)
7. City Teachers							-	-.60 (p=.14)
8. Exempted Teachers								-

[a] Insufficient numbers of supervisors were available from these small schools where in most cases the school principals are expected to function in teacher supervisor roles as well as building administrators.

[b] Other related findings: 1) average of the 28 Rho coefficients is +.15, 2) Kendall's coefficient of concordance w = .26, p = .08.

[c] All p's are one-tail probabilities.

Table 4

Means, Ranks, and Correlations Describing How Testing Directors in Two Geographic Locations and in Three Different School Organizations Responded to the Five Standardized Testing Purposes

	Geographic Location						School Organization					
	Rural (31)		Suburban (45)		Urban[a]		Local (35)		City (35)		Ex. V. (11)	
Purposes	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
1. Administration	3.48	5	3.58	5	--	--	3.63	5	3.69	4.5	3.09	3
2. Curriculum	2.87	2	2.18	2	--	--	3.09	3	1.97	1	1.82	1
3. Exceptional	3.36	4	3.24	4	--	--	3.11	4	3.43	3	3.55	4
4. Counseling	3.07	3	3.62	3	--	--	2.94	2	3.69	4.5	3.82	5
5. Instruction	2.19	1	2.16	1	--	--	2.06	1	2.11	2	2.73	2

Spearman Rho Correlations for School Organization[b]

	(1)	(2)	(3)
1. Local Testing Directors	-	+.38 (p=.27)*	+.10 (p=.43)
2. City Testing Directors		-	+.82 (p=.04)
3. Exempted Testing Directors			-

[a] Analysis omitted due to only 5 respondents.

[b] Other related findings: 1) There was perfect agreement or a Rho of +1.00 between the ranks of the rural and suburban testing directors, 2) the average of the three Rho coefficients for the school organization is +.42, 3) Kendall's coefficient of concordance w = .61, p = .12.

[c] All p's are one-tail probabilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Means, Ranks, and Correlations Describing How Testing Directors with Varying Backgrounds in Testing and Whether or Not They were Trained as Counselors Responded to the Five Standardized Testing Purposes

	Number of Classes						Nature of Training					
	2 or fewer (25)			3 or more (54)			Counselors (36)			Not Counselors (45)		
Purposes	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Rank
1. Administration	3.20	1.58	3	3.61	1.50	5	3.78	1.44	5	3.31	1.58	3
2. Curriculum	2.44	1.23	1.5	2.37	1.31	2	.86	1.33	2	2.09	1.15	1
3. Exceptional	3.28	1.43	4	3.35	1.29	4	3.08	1.42	4	3.49	1.22	4
4. Counseling	3.64	1.15	5	3.30	1.27	3	2.92	1.20	3	3.76	1.13	5
5. Instruction	2.44	1.36	1.5	2.09	1.15	1	2.22	1.31	1	2.13	1.16	2

Spearman Rho correlation for number of classes corrected for ties = +.56, one-tail p = .16

Spearman Rho correlation for training = +.50, one-tail p = .19.